(Present)

1891-92.
(L. R.)

File No. 120 of 91
Serial No. 1615

Sub - Appeal of Pitthanna of Kolur talak regarding the Shanbhog Service. (and)

6795

(Reserve)

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

LR 41 – 1882

1891–92
~~192~~ .
(L. R.)

File No 120 of 97

Serial Nos. 1 to 15

Later references.

L. R. 120 of 97

LR 593-340 (1-3)
LR 593-340 (4-9)
" 575-44-1-2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1 to 15

M ~~Part~~ B for September 1898.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of ~~J. Krishna Rao of Bangalore and~~ Puttanna of Kylancur, Kolar taluk regarding the Shanbhogi Service lands. —

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Petition No 1933 of 1893-94
and Letter Enquiry dated No 587
of 1895-96.

Petitioners :- 1 Pattanna
2 Adivyha son
of Pattanna

Petitioners' case is that Pattanna (No 1) was the Nayadi Gumasta of the Channapatna Taluk & that upon appointment as Peishcar in 1874 after a service of 20 years that he was offered a better paid & other place which declined & was then appointed Head Sheristadar, Deputy Commissioner's Office, Mysore, on which he waited for due promotion being made to him. appointed Head & the post of Sheristadar of Kyatnur, which charge & the removal of the Havildar for some fault was taken away, held & Sundries that he was put in possession of the Service Inam Lands and was performing the duties relating & to the Inam suits relating to the Service Lands of Inamdars situated in it and to the same

I do not think that the Petr. has any grievance. Matters may be removed in connection with the Shanbhoga's hereditary Inamdars already passed cannot be reviewed at this distance of time & he must reconcile himself with the facts that this matter in connection with Petitioner has come down and. Should in consideration of Petitioner's past services the Dy Comr may be asked to grant some small allowance to the Petitioner who is evidently in receipt of Inam Lands

Draft reply for Mr Abbott under
26-8-95

Received 28.8.95
Despatched 29.8.95

26.8.95

of Gold, and due to the minor
chiefs in the village; that
whilst in the Kayangattadan of
Kapilivai for the days mentioned
as he was with the rest of Kandyan
them; that the 1st for Puttanna
having resided that night there
were proceedings in civil, Criminal
and Revenue Courts and the
(Puttanna) Generally proceeded
to prove that the lands were
Service Tenure lands; that the
lands were thereupon fully restored
and given to the Kayangattadan
instead of being vested in Puttanna
who had given a large amount of
money & personal labor in the cause
of the litigation; that the office
of Shanthy was further vested
in the appellant as the son of the
Headman while no Recognition was
made to Pte Puttanna who had
a claim on same for his past services
and that Puttanna have up to the
continued to discharge the duties
of the Shanthy's assistant remunerative
Petitioner prays:—

(1) that the lands referred to be
taken back from the Kayangattadan
and given to Pte

(2) that one of the sons be removed
from the Kayangattadan or appl

X Rs. 428.7-4,
Vide D. of accompanying
Memorandum

of the Kandyan Chiefs
for [illegible] and upon which
he [illegible] and the said
petitioner, -

(3) that the petitioner, the 2nd [illegible]
be [illegible] with an [illegible]
in consideration of the services
of the [illegible] & the circumstances
under which he was [illegible] and
deprived of, the [illegible] of Mandiya

Upon a petition presented by
the 1st petr in April 1892 the
Report of the Asst Commr Kotte
was called for, and the petr
was informed by endorsement,
of what the Deputy Commissioner
reported in his letter No. 4189/1036
dated 20th June 1893 (appended).
No order with reference to the petr's
prayer was communicated. The
petitions now presented, which
are pending order, are with refce
to that endorsement.

As regards the 1st prayer -
the circumstances under which
the service grant was resumed
and the lands were allowed to be
held by the Kapuwattadas are
explained in paras 8, 9 and 11
of the accompanying Memorandum

As regards the 2nd prayer -
the 1st petr Pallawena may be said
to have held the office Mandiyar

for four years, from 88 till
August 1886, when the Act
on the petition of one Sundappa
ordered the appointment of
Sundappa son (Circle only finder
fee) into the vacancy (Collector
767 & 12-8-95). There is nothing
to show that the allegation of
that the have continued to discharge
the duties of the office till the present
time is true. It is a question for
consideration whether or not
the excess of Kandayan over the
old fodi and cess may be paid
to the [illegible] for the years during
which he performed the duties
of the office if it is shown he deserves
no remuneration - There is
however one document applicable
of judgment in Civil Case No 54
of 1886 produced by him, which
shows that [illegible] took the produce
of tamarind trees in the Kaun land
in the year which that proceeding
related and it is possible he may
have taken the produce of that
year under the Government
order giving him possession.
But in recovery the full assess-
ment of the lands from the Kayan
-sultan from 1878-79 the
Government has acted on the
assumption that Kayanguttada
that he had possession since then.

As regards the 2nd charge -
that was rejected in the decree in
July 1886, vide order appended.

Submitted for orders -

22-8-95

Read
22/8

In pet[n] No 1216 of 1579/95
(Serial No 19), Suttanna
alleged that notwithstanding
the appointment of Gundappa
Son (Krishna Rao) in 1886, he
had been himself doing the Shanbogs
duties under the Dy Comm[r]'s
orders & claimed remuneration
from 1881 to 1895

The Dy Comm[r] who was
directed to report on the petition
stated that Suttanna
was Shanbog in his own
right from 1881 to 1886, having
been appointed by the Dy Comm[r]
on the dismissal of Gundappa
& that, when in 1886 Govt
directed the restoring of Krishna
Rao son of Gundappa as
Shanbogue, Suttanna was
allowed by the respondents to
act as manager

The Dy Comm[r] accepted

Suggested that as the Shanbogue
Serui Lands were in the
possn of the Kayamgadde
& charged with full assessment,
the assessment moneys
the govt should be paid
to the officiating Shanbogue
as remuneration (Serial No 22)

The govt sanctioned this
recommendation & directed
that the amount should
be paid to the Shanbog-
Reported and his grievance (Serial No 26)

= A petition from Adappa, Son
of Puttanna asking for
some appointment in
consideration of his father's
services was forwarded to
GA Western Div for
favourable orders

My 5/4/98

2957
27-4-92

(2)

3. 10-12-89. ಅಚ್ಚಿಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಬಾ
2-8-89. ಬಿಳಿ
3-2-89. ಕಾಳಿ
15-2-89. ಕೆಂಪು
9-3-90. ಕಾಳಿ
11-12-89. ಕಾಳಿ
26-7-89 ಅಚ್ಚಿಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಬಾ

ಅಂಬಾಸ್ಟ್ರಾಂಗ್
ಅಸ್ಸಾಡಿಮ್

4.

5.

6.

ನಂಬರು	ಕಾರ್ಯ	ನಂಬರು	ಕಾರ್ಯ
237.	5-5-85.	2202	6-11-85
727	5-7-85.	2890.	7-1-86.
2500.	24-11-85.	1102.	5-5-85.
4031.	21-11-86.		
1102	16-9-85.		

7.

8.

10

11

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 447/1

ಸ್ಥಳ
16-5-92

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 445

No. 32 K.

Endt issued 2nd May 1892

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 235

dated 14-4-92 received at the

Dewan's Office from Mallamma

Meerchegere of Kyalasanahalli,

Kolar Taluk, praying that he may

be paid Rs 400 old being the Huttawalle

collections on his seven maniands,

that his son may be installed in

his father's place as Patel and

or that he (the son) may be favored

with full pension

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~

~~enclosures~~, to the Deputy Commissioner

Kolar District, for disposal

or report, if necessary

By Order,

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
2nd May 1892

19. Pet 82 - 4/11

(General Serial No. 30.)

1893 15244.

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar district

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore.

Dated 20th June 1893

Despatched 23rd do.

Received

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 4189

No. 836

In reply to

SUBJECT.

Submitting report on the petition of Pottanna late Shanbogue of Gualiur for local Faizik - - - - -

Petition

Refer -

1. Pet No 6838 dated 7.12.89 271

2 " 1074 dated 19.4.86 46

3. The Kyatsandra Manigi Records

BR 30/6

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Kolar District,
Dated 22nd June 893-

No 4189 en 1
1036

(51)

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore-

Sir,

With reference to your official Memorandum No=32 dated April 892 forwarding for disposal & report if necessary, a petition from Muttaiah late Shanbhogue of Kyatanur, Kolar Taluk, praying that he may be paid Rupees 400 odd, being the "Hutaravi" collection on the seven Mamool lands that have now been appointed to the Petitioner) since as Virgadi Ummeda or that the Petitioner) may be favoured with a pension, I have the honor to state that under the Orders conveyed in Government Proceedings No= 6955/27 dated the 7th December 1889 the Shanbhogue Inam of Kayenguta Kyatanur village has been resumed and the lands comprised therein which have since been duly assessed by the Survey Department will be confirmed to the Kayengutadar on full survey assessment as he has been in the enjoyment of the same from 878-79.

* hereinafter referred

2. The assessment collected from the Kayengutadar on the lands in question goes to the credit of Government- The Petitioner is not entitled to receive the same as it has already been decided in the

Government Proceedings No. 1174/46 dated 9th April 1886 that the claim be sent to the Financial office.

3. The Petitioner did not serve in this district as a Nagadi Gumasta and so I am not aware of his claim for a pension or for an appointment for his son. He seems to have only held the post of Nagadi Gumasta for the last eight years, Bangalore district.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Nagendrayya

for Deputy Commissioner

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 295. ೫/೯೨ L. R. 120-91-4

[illegible] 26-12-93

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1892 [illegible]

[illegible] 14 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 7-12-1889 [illegible] $\frac{6888}{271}$ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1878-79 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 19-4-86 [illegible] $\frac{1074}{46}$ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 15 [illegible] 1893 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

"By order"

Draft

[illegible]

Chief Secretary.

(General Serial No. 32.)

1893.

No. 1933 (11)

Name of Petitioner. Pallavaram (Cale
Nagadi Somayya & Reddi Cale

Village. Kalmur

Taluk. Kolar

District. Kolar

Date of Art. 6th January 1893

Date of Receipt. 11th January 1893

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Two

ABSTRACT.

Praying for a renewal of the orders passed by Govt and communicated to Petitioner by Endorsement No 2987 dt 15th December 1893 viz Inam Lands attached to the Shanbogueship of Kalmur Village. -

Recommended

Rejected.

MYSORE STAMPS OFFICE.
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
REGD. NO. 1933
DATE 16-1-94

ಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಂಶ ಪ್ರ
ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ
ಪಡೆದು ಕಡತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ನೀಡಿದೆ

4

ಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಂಶ ಪ್ರ
ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ
ಪಡೆದು ಕಡತದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡಲಾಗಿದೆ
ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ನೀಡಿದೆ

4

5

6

7

8

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ ಎರಡು ಅಂಕಗಳು.

೧. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೨. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಾಣಿಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೩. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಪಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೪. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಪಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೫. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಮರಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೬. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಮರಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೭. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಹೂವುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೮. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಹೂವುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೯. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಹಣ್ಣುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೧೦. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಹಣ್ಣುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೧೧. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಕೀಟಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೧೨. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಕೀಟಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೧೩. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಹಾವುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೧೪. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಹಾವುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೧೫. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಮೀನುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೧೬. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಮೀನುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೧೭. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಕಪ್ಪೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೧೮. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಕಪ್ಪೆಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೧೯. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಹುಳುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೨೦. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಹುಳುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೨೧. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಜೇಡಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೨೨. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಜೇಡಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೨೩. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಚೇಳುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೨೪. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಚೇಳುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೨೫. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಏಡಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೨೬. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಏಡಿಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೨೭. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಸೀಗಡಿಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೨೮. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಸೀಗಡಿಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೨೯. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಮಿಡತೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೩೦. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಮಿಡತೆಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೩೧. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಚಿಟ್ಟೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೩೨. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಚಿಟ್ಟೆಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೩೩. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಜೇನುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೩೪. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಜೇನುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೩೫. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಇರುವೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೩೬. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಇರುವೆಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೩೭. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಗೆದ್ದಲುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೩೮. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಗೆದ್ದಲುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೩೯. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಜಿರಳೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೪೦. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಜಿರಳೆಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೪೧. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಸೊಳ್ಳೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೪೨. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಸೊಳ್ಳೆಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೪೩. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ನೊಣಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೪೪. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ನೊಣಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೪೫. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಹೇನುಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೪೬. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಹೇನುಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೪೭. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಉಣ್ಣೆಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೪೮. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಉಣ್ಣೆಗಳು ಇವೆ?

೪೯. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲು ಯಾವ ಚಿಗಟಗಳು ಇದ್ದವು?

೫೦. ಕಾಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಯಾವ ಚಿಗಟಗಳು ಇವೆ?

1895

(17)

Proceedings of the Goobyallycore.

L. Ex. 120-91-6

Read:-

Petition No. 1933 of 1893-94 and subsequent petitions from Puttamma, late Shanbhag of Kyalanur, Kolar Taluk, relating that he was Nagadi gumastah of Chenna-patna Taluk with a service of 20 years and was thrown out of employment at the reduction in 1874; that 1881 he was appointed as Shanbhag of Kyalanur Kayamughalla villages; that the Inamti Lands were claimed by the Kayamgullader, and, though proved to be service ~~Inam~~, were given to the Kayamgullader on full

assessment

assessment and that
The office of Shanbhag had been
ordered to be restored to the
Hakdari's son in 1886; and
praying that the lands referred
to may be given him, that
the amount of assessments
recovered from the Kaigam
gowda minus the Jodi
and cess due to Govt be
paid to him, and that his
son be provided with an
appointment.

Order thereon No. 2055 dated 5th Sept 1895
PP 36-95

Government
observe that the petitioner
has no grievance which
has to be removed in
connection with this Shan-
bhag hak. The orders
already passed cannot
be reviewed at the
petitioners

misfortune and he must reconcile himself with the fact that his connection with that office has come to an end.

In consideration however of the petitioner's past services, the Deputy Commissioner is requested to give some small appointment to the Petitioner or to his son if either of them is fit for any other appointment ~~in consideration of the petitioner's past services~~.

Dpl. 31-8-95
Revenue Secretary

29-8-95

To.
The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District.

నవంబర్
1933

(1)

G. O. Rt. 120-41-7

1895

No. 1216

Name of Petitioner, Shanbogue Pattam

Village, Kyalanur

Taluk, Kolar

District, Kolar

Date of Arzi, 15-9-95

Date of Receipt, 17-9-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure,

L.R. 120-91-8

Interrupted -
Sab's letter dtd 2 with file

7/10

Petr alleges that
notwithstanding the
abolishment of
Shanbhogue vatan in
1856, the Authority
accepted the duties
of Shanbhogue under
Mr Ryder of the Kolar
Taluq. He accordingly
claims remuneration
from 1857 to 1895.
If his allegation is
true, it is a question
whether his case is
not entitled to some
consideration.

Called on 2 Issues
9

Arzi 9-10-95
Sub's report
when received
13.10.95

ABSTRACT.

This office endorsement dt 9-9-95 stating that there are grounds for altering the order regarding the Shanbogue of Kyalanur and that there is no use of the Petr petitioning this office again and again since his last claim is the Shanbogue of the above village; but in consideration of his previous service an appointment may be given to him or his son"

States that the Petr never claimed the Shanbogueship of the above village; that he only claims the Police Inam for the period for which he acted as Shanbogue; that great hard-

ceived no orders regarding the Pilgi amount;
at he was appointed Chaukidar by Govt. order
nd consequently his pay for the period for
hich the arrears of Chaukidari is due;
nd that out of the 5 years Pilgi amount
nly one years due has been received by him -

He prays that the Pilgi amount for the
emaining 4 years may be made due to
im by the Kayamgunidars of the above village -

Sd- 7/9-

1216/96
17-9-96

17-9-96

3.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

(20)

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read:

L.R. 120-91-9

Petition Regd no 1216 dated 15th September 1895 from Puttanna of Kyalnoor in the Kolar Taluk claiming remuneration for the Shanbhogi duties he performed from 1881 to 1895 in the said village.

Order thereon No 3797 Pet-799 Dy 15/10/95 21

Petitioner alleges that notwithstanding the appointment of Gundappa son in 1886, he has himself been doing the duties of Shanbhog under the orders of the Deputy Comm. He accordingly claims remuneration from 1881 to 1895. If his allegation is true it is a question whether his case is not

entitled to some consideration.

2 The Deputy Commr is requested to report whether the allegation is true or not & if true whether he has any objection to the petitioner's prayer being granted.

(Draft)

Revenue Secretary
KCH
14.10.

To the Deputy Commr
Kolar
With the petition read above.

Copies of the petition & connected papers are returned herewith.

CP
15-10-95

1896 (21

No. 272

Name of Petitioner, [illegible]

Village, [illegible]

Taluk, [illegible]

District,

Date of Arzi, 27-1-96

Date of Receipt, 31-1-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 4

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

To.

(21)

one two Rupee Stamp. Office of the Government of Mysore

The humble Petition of J. Nicholas Rao, (son of the late Jangamakote Comdapa) Advocate residing in Ooloorpetta Bangalore City

Respectfully sheweth,

That the Petitioner's name was registered as the Shanbogue of his alwar and other villages in the Sirlaghe Taluq Kolar Dt by the Deputy Commissioner Kolar Dt on 7th July 1886. (Vide Exhibit C hereunto annexed) as per Order of the Durbar of Mysore dated 3rd May 1886 (Vide Exhibit B).

That since 1886 the Petitioner presented a dozen petitions to the Dy Comr of Kolar praying that the possession of the Service Inam lands attached to the said Shanbogue Office be given to him and a Pattah issued in his name. The Petr regrets that not one of these petitions fetched any reply.

That the said lands were for a number of years in the wrongful possession of the Koyengoottadar Appajiah of Kyalahow from whom the hairig was recovered by Govt during the years of his wrongful occupation, and that he had no title to such lands is plain from Exhibits A, D, E & F. (Vide Chiefly Exhibit E dated 22/6/92)

That the said lands are intended for the remuneration of the Shanbogue Office is plain from Exhibits D, & A.

That the Petr regrets that in the face of such Orders on Record especially as those found in Exhibits A and E, the Dy Comm Kolar Dt has thought fit to allow the Koyengoottadar to be still in possession of such lands as per his order dated 29th June 93. (Vide Exhibit F)

That the Petrs claims and rights to have these been completely ignored, and the person

entitled to the said lands as Shanbogue is by the order of the Deputy Comm^r deprived of same (Vide Exhibit G).

That even the D^y Comm^r in the same order (Vide last para of Exhibit G) is compelled to say that if the Petr is the Hakdar of the Shanbogue office, his claims will be considered if he establishes it before him.

That the Petr besides forwarding innumerable petitions personally appeared before the D^y Comm^r Kolar in July 1894 and prayed for the prosecution of those claims. The D^y Comm^r who promised to send an Indorsement has not done so yet. That there can be no doubt that Petr is the rightful Hakdar of the Shanbogue office is plain from Exhibit C which says "Krishnadas's shared be registered and Shanbogue's duty taken from Doddaya as Gromastah." Petr fails to see why the present D^y Comm^r should ignore the order of his predecessor in office.

That as the innumerable petitions addressed to the D^y Comm^r by Petr have not fetched a reply, Petr is compelled to seek redress at the hand of the Govt of Mysore, (even after the patient waiting of ten years) for a reconstitution of his right to the said Service Inam lands.

That with a view to appeal to Government Petitioner in July last applied both to the D^y Comm^r of Kolar & to the Govt of Mysore for authenticated Copies of certain Orders & proceedings herein stated, and sent the required stamps and Copying fees. Petr regrets very much that though six months have elapsed the Govt of Mysore have not furnished him with the Copies he had applied for, and that the D^y Comm^r of Kolar hereby sent two of the Orders applied for and not the other two orders, though Petr sent reminders, and tried the charges.

That thus Petr has already waited for ten years (from 1886, the date of his application to Shanbogue) and that Orders adverse to his rights have been passed as per Exhibit G; he has, to lose no further

in waiting for Copies

time, determined to forward this present petition to
Government with the Copies of the Nerushadar
his disposal, trusting that even after this delay
justice would be done to him.

That the Petr has during the last ten years been
executing the duties of the Office of Shanboque without
any remuneration, and that in spite of his repeated
requests to be given the possession of the Service Inam
lands attached to the said Office, a person the least
entitled to such lands is allowed to possess them, &
the latest order of the Govt (Vide Exhibit G) gives the said
lands to the very same Kayangootadar from whom
the lands were taken back under orders of Govt as he
had no right to them. Petitioner fails to see how
a Kayangootadar could acquire title to Service
Inam lands while a Shanboque exists to
recognized, and for the remuneration of whose
duties, only the lands are primarily intended.

Petitioner in conclusion requests
that as he is the Registered holder of the Shanboque
Office of Kyalicoor (Vide Exhibit C), he be given
immediately the possession of the Service Inam Lands
attached to this Office. That as Petitioner has been
performing the duties of the said Office, he requests
that the amount recovered as Dasiz from
the Kayangootadar for the years of his wrongful
occupation of the said Service Inam Lands,
which amount now is deposited in the Taluq
Treasury be paid to Petitioner as he is the
person rightfully entitled to receive the same

That the Petitioner is ready to appear and represent his case personally before the Govt and offer any explanation he can, if ordered to do so. That as already ten years have elapsed without his getting any sort of reply from the Mysore Kolar auth his claim, Petitioner requests that the Govt of Mysore at least would pass early orders on this Petition and see justice done to Petitioners' rights.

For which act of kindness and justice Petitioner beg to remain

The most Obedient Humble
Servant of the
Govt of Mysore
J. Krishna Rau

1. Ulsoor Bala
Bangalore
28/Jan/1896

Gen. 31] (22) 1896 file 7620 653

N.R. 120-91-11

Send with reference to the note and enclosure on paper (9)

16/4

Tuesday 3rd (accepted)
17-4-96

Asfetta from Kuttiana Rao (which is referred to in paragraph 1 of the Chief Com's letter) is also submitted herewith. (4)

16/4

17-4-96

From The Secretary Commissioner Mysore Residency

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revenue and General Depts

Dated 16th April 1896

Despatched

Received

General No. 3823
No. 1012

Enclosure No. 1 piece

Relating to the petition from Poottanna Gowda

Subject — — —

This case has been very clear. I understand the facts to be that Poondappa was the Shanbogue & he was removed - & one Boollappa was appointed. Meanwhile his brother son of Poondappa appealed his claim was ordered by the Sheristadar - Poottanna acquiesced in the order in favour of Krishna Rao & consented to continue as his Poomarta. In the event Poottanna as Poomarta & Krishnarao as the rejected Shanbogue have been discharging the duties & the remuneration which was in the shape of an inam land was later [illegible] Poondappa & Krishna Rao from him. Krishna Rao & Poottanna now claim that the appeal means the Poodi to be paid between and that the money already credited

9.4.96

9/4

Kolar Deputy Commissioners
Office
Dated 14th April 1896.

To.

The Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
Revenue and General
Departments.

Sir,

With reference to Government
Proceedings No. 3797 / Pet-799 dated 15th
October 1895 forwarding for report
a petition from Puttanna of
Kyalanur in the Kolar Taluk,
claiming remuneration for the
Shanbhogi duties he performed
from 1881 to 1895 in the said village
I have the honour to State that
Petitioner Puttanna having been
appointed the Shanbhogue of
Kayamgutta Kyalanur village and
2 Circar villages vice Gundappa
dismissed continued to do duty
until

Recommended
returned

or whether these people or any of them are entitled to the money the land being already adjudged to the Kayangudadar. If the land had not been taken possession of by the Kayangudadar and continued as Inam the Government would have been only entitled to its Jodi amount. As to transfer to a third party under special circumstances should, I submit, make no difference.

Reference

6. The arrears due on the land were recovered at the instance of the Shanbhogue who complained that he had been wrongfully dispossessed of it by the Kayangudadar but the Government in consideration of the Kayangudadar's long possession confirmed it to him subject to his paying its full

demand

Survey assessment with all arrears.

7. As Puttanna discharged the duties of Shanbhogueship in his own right being appointed to the office in [illegible] for Mr. Ricketts after Gundappas dismissal and then as Krishna Rao gumasta, he is clearly entitled to receive the amount mentioned.

8. Puttanna has given up claiming the office of Shanbhogue and is ready to come to terms with the Registerdar Krishna Rao for the future. They may therefore be left to settle between themselves and the interest of the Government is confined to seeing that a proper person is appointed to discharge the duties of the Shanbhogue.

9. The assessment on the Inam land annually recovered from the Kayamguttadar minus the

the fixed amount should be paid
to the officiating Shanbogue

10. The original papers bearing
on the subject as per accompanying
Tenat are herewith submitted for
reference and obliging return when
no longer required

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant
Kasaganayaja
for Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District
Tamil

work held in deposit may also be given them. In some instances they may also be dealt with that they have been doing the work continuously the recommendation is made & the money thus realised amounts in deposit amounts should be paid to them.

8/11/1967

(26)

Read.

Petition No 216 dated 15th September 1895 from Pullāmma of Tyalmur Kilar praying that claiming remuneration for the Shanbhogi duties of the Village of Shanbog which he performed from 1857 to 1895 in the said Village.

S.R. 120-91-12

Petition No 2712 dated 28th January 1896 from Tirchinadan, Rayasidar Shanbog of Tyalmur. claiming possession of the Service Inam Lands attached to the Office of Shanbog and the amounts recovered as Peris from the Kavelgnattadar of Tyalmur for the period of his occupation of the said lands.

Letter from the Dy Commr Kilar No 3893/1012 dated 1st April 1896, forwarding the Petitions together with a report on the subject with reference to Govt Procs No 3797/P 799 of the 15th October 1895.

No 4769/F.S. 36-95 dt 26.4.96

Order thereon

The facts of the case briefly are as follows:

Gundlupet

Gundappa of Jampenkile was the Shanbog of Kyalmar and he was deposed in Sept 1681. Pottanna was appointed Shanbog of the village ~~as the latter~~ died. Meanwhile Krishnadas, Son of Gundappa, agitated his claim and ~~was ordered to be~~ the Regulation. Pottanna acquiesced in the order in favor of Krishnadas and consented to continue as his Gumasta. In the result, Pottanna as Gumasta and Krishnadas as the registered Shanbog, have been discharging the duties. ~~The village is Pottanna~~.

in Govt Pro: No: 1074 & 19.4.86 it was decided 46 that he should be appointed to the Office

As regards the remuneration it was in the shape of an Inam land, which was taken possession of by the ~~Collector~~ Kyasima Sultandar and full Survey assessment is levied from him. Krishnadas and Pottanna now claim that the assessment minus the pot be paid to them and that the money already credited to Govt

Govt and held in deposit may also be given them. The Dy Commr reports that they are entitled to it and that they have been doing the work continuously.

2 The Govt observe that the recommendation of the Dy Commr is reasonable and accordingly decide that the money credited to Government on account of the assessment on the Shanbog Service Inam Lands minus the fodi together with what is held in deposit minus the fodi be paid to the Shanbog-registrar and his Gumasta.

26/11/96
For Secretary

To
The Dy Commr
Kadur
returning the Ror.
Record.

26/11/96

(25)

[illegible] 1216-2712 [illegible] 4

[illegible] 1-12-96

L.C. 120-91-13

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1896 [illegible] 28 [illegible]

[illegible] 1895 [illegible]

2712 [illegible] 1216 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 26 [illegible] 1896 [illegible]

[illegible] 25/11/96
For Secy

Draft

[illegible] 25/11/96

2897/897 file.

GA Petitions. Revenue Boards.

Disposed of F. 36 of 95.

Rec'd 25/8/98

S. R. 120-91-14

Petn

P. 7 No 36-95 - Copies with P. 768-98 returned.

Rec'd 27/8/98

Subd. The prior petition No 2897 was filed on 11. Aug 98 (this asks for a higher appointment & petitioner or pensum)

29.8.98

Subd to Secretary

According to the petr's own statement his services were dispensed with in 1874. If he was entitled to a pensum he should then have applied in the ordinary course through his departmental head (see 17)

In so no. 2558 of 5/9/98, the Governor was requested to give a small appointment to the petr on account of the petr's past services. 91-appeals

From petr no. 2897 of 4/6/98 (the first in B file) that the petr's services were made light-

Read 31/8/98

1898

No. 386

Name of Petitioner Puttanna Late Nagarigumsala of the Closepet Taluk

Village Kyatanur

Taluk Kolar

District Kolar

Date of Arzi 6-8-98

Date of Receipt 15-8-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

ABSTRACT

Petitioner states as follows — That he has served this Govt. for 20 years. That in the reduction which was made in 1874 his services were dispensed with. That when he was offered an appointment carrying less salary than his previous appointment he did not accept it. That his further attempts to get a suitable appointment was not successful. That while his services were dispensed with he was a hapless

a prayer that in accordance
with Govt. Proceedings
No 4601/128 of 11-12-88 he
may be given pension for
his services of 20 yrs
as he has a very large family
depending upon him.

Mng.
18/8/98

~~A copy of the above Petition~~
Ltd
7.11.98

Retrenched in the
Class 2 Gr
2-9-98

Rep can
4:1:98
Genl: Rds for Remarks

AK
2-9-98

A copy of Govt Rn: No 4601-3.11.88/128
petitn
Ltd
2/9/98

Rd on 3.9.98
AK
Submd to Secretary
Mng
5/9/98 for the order. As the applicant's
petr's case, he must show
that his pensionary claims were
compounded in 1874 for an
appr. 5 his son.
7/9/98

I direct that the said
claim for pension
be rejected as the
petitioner is
not entitled
to any
pension
as claimed in
this petn

Secy to Govt
7-9-98

386.R
DATE 15-8-98

Mysore-registered
15.8.98
mm

3

4

5

6

7

[illegible] — 5-9-95

2555 — [illegible]

[illegible] 36-95

[illegible]

9 [illegible] 97 [illegible]

10 [illegible]

[illegible]

12 [illegible]

128

Proceedings of the Hon'ble Mr. [illegible] Registrar to the Madras High Court, (General), dated 11th September, 1888.

(Under Madras Act — of 1888, dated Bangalore, 11th September, 1888.

Heads of Departments and other Government Officers are requested not to countenance the fraudulent claims of pensioners by promising to procure for their sons or other relations. Such promises, if fulfilled, would prevent the efficiency of the public service. Officers, on the other hand, should not promise Servants' pensions or gratuity but only recommend. The appointments of sons of pensioners should, where such qualifications, be by open competition, but a preference should not be given to the sons of pensioners over other candidates in consideration of their father's services. In case such competition arising will not apply.

(Signed) [illegible]
Chief Secretary.

To

The Registrar, Commissioners of Public Debts.
The Heads of Departments.

28

S.R. 120-91-15

"Byrada"

"Bofi"

Fir Scay

14/9/92